THE WAY TO ATTAIN AND SECURE PEACE.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY
FEB 4 1924

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. D. KELLEY,

OF PENNSYLVANIA.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 19, 1862.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, Mr. KELLEY said:

MR. CHAIRMAN, I cannot announce to the House, as the eloquent gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CRISFIELD] who has just concluded, did, when he began his remarks, that what I am about to say is well considered and carefully prepared, for I came to the House this morning with no thought of occupying any portion of its time and attention. But it seems to me that before the week closes some rejoinder should be made to the various suggestions in favor of peace and compromise, and of hostility to the acts and policy of the President of the United States, that we have been hearing from day to day. And, unprepared as I am, I propose to reply to a few of these suggestions. I can promise that my words shall be honest, frank, and earnest, though my argument may lack arrangement.

Permit me to say, sir, that I am in favor of peace. I was for peace when I first raised my voice in this House. I was then, as I am now, for early and enduring peace; for peace on terms honorable to the people of the country, and which shall not dishonor the memory of the wise and patriotic men who established the independence and unity of our country, and ordained its beneficent institutions.

I am, sir, for peace so secured that it shall prevail forever over that broad territory which, at the last presidential election, was covered by thirty-four State constitutions, and that which, as territory, belongs to the United States, but which will come under the jurisdiction of States whose people shall know no sovereignty save that which resides in the Constitution as it came to us from the fathers. How, sir, can such a peace be attained? It can only be done by remembering, first and always, that the supreme law of the land is the Constitution of the United States; and that we, as members of this House, are sworn to support that Constitution; and that the President of the United States is sworn to preserve, protect and defend it. My theory is, sir, that rights and duties are things reciprocal. So long as the people of a State obey the behests of the Constitution, and live in accordance with them, they are entitled to the enjoyment of all constitutional rights. So long as they array themselves against

them only in such force that the marshal and his *posse* may suppress their violent demonstrations, they are entitled to all those rights, save as the penal code properly applied may abridge them. But, when, as has been the case in the so-called seceding States, they assemble in organic conventions and throw off all duty to the Government; when they abjure loyalty and duty, and claim to have established on our soil an independent and foreign government; when they attempt in the name and by the agency of such alleged foreign government, to create a navy, and do assemble armies to contend with the power of the Government, and thereby banish our customs and postal system, and close our courts, they lose their title to constitutional rights, and it becomes the duty of the Government, by whatever force it may require, to regain possession and control the territory occupied by them, and to rule the people occuping it with such hostile purposes, irrespective of State lines, or State names, or State institutions or State constitutions. It must maintain the unity of the country; and if the inhabitants will disregard all their duties, it must govern them under the power of the Constitution that makes the President Commander-in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and that requires him, if so it must be, by military force to maintain the supremacy of the Government over every acre of our territory. When supreme jurisdiction shall be thus established, we may say to whomsoever may occupy the country, or particular portions of it, "adopt your State constitution, whether the one that formerly prevailed or another: open your courts, and let the courts of the United States be opened; let our customs system and our postal system be enforced; avow your allegiance to our Constitution and Government, and as you shall perform the duties, enjoy, also, the rights of American citizens."

Gentlemen on the other side seem to forget that sworn duty, as well as patriotism and the future welfare and peace of the country, demand the maintenance of the unity of our territory, and of the supremacy of the power of the United States over it in its entirety. These are things that must be maintained, if we would avoid standing armies and unceasing war. Where all duties under the Constitution are rejected, no rights can be claimed, and the Government must be maintained by force. That is my position, and it is, I believe, the position of the loyal people of the country. When I say loyal, I mean it; as I know no conditions that may accompany its expression. That loyalty which is conditional stretches forth a friendly hand to treason. [Suppressed applause in the gallery.] Indeed, conditional loyalty is partial treason. The President's emancipation proclamation has been the subject of invective and denunciation this morning, and it has been said that no man in the country, save the President of the United States, believes that it will promote peace. Sir, has territory ceased to be territory? Do figures still indicate numbers and power? Has the lesser come, by some new influence, to comprehend the greater? For, if it be not so, the enforcement of that proclamation will promote peace by aiding in the establishment of the supremacy of the Government. Has not the question as to whether four millions of stalwart people shall labor for us or for those with whom we are at war, some importance and a direct bearing on the issue? Will its solution, if it transfer them from one side to the other, have no influence upon the power of the rebellion? I believe, with the President, that it will. There are four millions of brawny right arms, mostly dark-colored, but many of them, through the fell influence of the hell-born institution of slavery, fair as our own; there are four millions of people reluctantly giving their daily toil to the support of this rebellion; and it is proposed by the President to invite them, on the 1st of January next, as wisdom would have done more than a year ago, to withhold their labors from that cause and bestow them, as they desire to, upon the cause of patriotism, freedom and peace, under the starry flag of our country. Who will tell me that the transfer of the labor of these people will have no influence in suppressing the rebellion?

But, asked the eloquent gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. YEAMAN]—whose elaborately prepared speech, I regret to say, contained, if I heard him aright, a sneer at those who read written arguments—whoever heard of a belligerent party taken private property on land? Let me ask him a question, to be answered in some of his future speeches, who ever heard of a belligerent prohibiting the people of the opposing power from rallying to his standard? He speaks of property, and I speak of *men*. It is a great thing, sir, to be a man.

Mr. YEAMAN. The gentleman will allow me to interrupt him.

Mr. KELLEY. I did not invite an immediate answer. As the gentleman guarded himself yesterday against interruption, so did I to-day propound a question to be answered in the future.

973.7
K21w

M. YEAMAN. Allow me one moment. I answer the gentleman by saying that I have cast no sneer upon anybody for reading written speeches. I answer him, also, by saying that slaves, so far from being persons in the eye of the laws of nations, as he treats them, while they are actually persons, are, by that Constitution, which he has sworn to support, the private property of private individuals, and that neither under the Constitutson, nor under the laws of nations, can you take private property on land as an act of war.

Mr. KELLEY. I take issue with the gentleman there, and if he will say that they are not designated in the Constitution as "persons," or point me to the clause in which they are designated as property, I will yield the point. The Constitution that I have sworn to support tells me that they—yes, the mothers, the fathers and the children all—are "PERSONS held to service." They are persons so held by virtue of that Constitution which has been spurned and trampled and spit upon, and yet he asks that those who have heaped these indignities upon that sacred instrument shall enjoy to the last iota the rights of loyal men under it. Did sane man ever utter so preposterous a proposition before? It is the service of these people we need. The proclamation invites them to our standard. He characterizes them as property. I say, with the Constitution, that they are persons, and as such will welcome them to our support. Their advent to freedom will exclude the necessity of the further draft or conscription of our sons and brothers.

Sir, I was remarking that it is a great thing to be a man, in contrast with horses, cows, and other cattle with which these poor people are habitually classified, and to which they have been assimulated by brutalizing laws. Man chains the lightning, makes the sun his servant, whitens the ocean with sails—his messengers to the poles in quest of knowledge—burdens its great waves with the commodities which his genius and toil have produced and which he is exchanging for others, the products of distant lands, more valuable to him. From the conflicting, elements, fire and water, he generates a vapory power that almost annihilates space, and practically removes mountains and levels valleys; and at the close of a life of usefulness, upon the sick-bed, he remembers and reviews the past, cheers, counsels, and blesses those about him, and, looking to heaven, feels that with God he is to live forever. The gentleman looks upon these millions of persons as property; so do bad institutions pervert gentle and generous natures. I say, sir, they are capable of all that ennobles man, and all that endears woman to man, and all that opens to either the great hereafter and its blessed hopes. It is of these woman, these children, these men, I speak, and I say that he can point to no case in which a belligerent has refused the aid of such as these when engaged in a war such as that which now engrosses and exhausts the energies of this country. Sir, the only thing about the President's proclamation that struck me as amiss was, that it was not, like the lightning, to take instant effect, and that its beneficent result should be postponed to so distant a day. Are these people, or the relation in which they stand to those who hold them to service, like cotton, leather, railroad depots, bad whisky, and other supposed analogous things suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky, yesterday? No, no. Trace back the laws of war so elaborately described by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CRISFIELD] to-day, and you will find that the invading force not only has always welcomed acquisitions from the ranks of the enemy, but that, in the good old days of chivalry, a herald invariably proceeded to the gates of a besieged town and offered immunity and protection to all who would join the invading Power. This chivalric example the President's proclamation pledges him to follow on the coming in of the glad new year. Let us hail the auspicious day!

I come back to the question with which I started. Will the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CRISFIELD], will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. YEAMAN], will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RICHARDSON], who so delights to dance the negro before us in all his various attitudes—will any one of these gentlemen, or of their learned coadjutors, say that it is not the duty of the President to maintain the unity of the country and the supremacy of the Constitution over all our territory? And if they will not say that, is there one of them who will say that he was wrong in thus inviting four millions of the people of the country to abandon rebellion and rally to the standard of loyalty, peace, and the Constitution? No one of them, I apprehend, will say so. Than this, in my judgment, mere sympathy with the rebellion could no further go. Gentlemen deny that slavery was the cause of this war. Let me ask them which one of the non-slaveholding States, from the first, has proposed to participate in it, and which one of the slaveholding States has been free from a desire to participate in

BURTON HIST. COLLECTION
DETROIT
EXCH

it, or from overt acts of rebellion? Why is it that prevailing loyalty and treason find their boundaries just here if slavery be not the controlling influence? I give praise to the border States for all they have done on the side of the country; but I remember that the first of the troops from my State to find service found it in the lower part of little Delaware; I remember that Marylanders were the first to shed the blood of New England in this unholy war; I remember that it is but recently, if indeed the question be at all settled, that Kentucky has been able to say with assurance that she has given more soldiers to the Union than to the rebel army. All honor and glory to the men of East Tennessee——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman permit me to correct him?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman has fallen into a very common mistake upon this question of the number of troops furnished by the people of Kentucky to the cause of the Union and of the rebellion.

Mr. KELLEY. Well, I will wave that question.

Ma. WADSWORTH. I suppose there have never been seven thousand men from the State of Kentucky in the rebellion. Very early in the fall of 1861 we had thirty-two regiments in the Union army; and I understand from our adjutant general, that we now have forty-three thousand men from the State of Kentucky in the Union army. I can say, in addition, that from twenty-five to thirty thousand inhabitants of Kentucky have born arms this summer and fall, without pay or compensation, in defense of their homes, it is true, but also in defence of the honor of the Union.

Mr. KELLEY. I had supposed that the question had been recently settled in favor of Kentucky's prevailing loyalty. It was, however, very debatable ground when we last assembled in this House, and I do not forget the fact that part of the Kentucky army has been led by a gentleman who—brief as is my legislative experience—was an active member on this floor when I came here in July of last year. Nor do I forget that Gen. Breckinridge and his forces have been sometimes repulsed by our arms.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me——

Mr. KELLEY I am simply arguing the point that every slave State has shown large sympathies with the rebellion, while no free State has gone into it, although many persons in the free States have manifested extreme sympathies with it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I simply want to correct an error of fact.

Mr. KELLEY. I am not in error in remembering that General Breckinridge, the late Democratic Vice-President, came from Kentucky, nor do I forget that Mr. Burnett, of this House, was a member from Kentucky. I am not mistaken in either of these facts. Burnett is in the Senate now, I believe, instead of in the field; but he was in the field as a soldier, and was transferred thence to the senate, to return to the field when the conclave of traitors adjourns.

But, as I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I give all honor to the men of East Tennessee. The heroic devotion to the Constitution they have exhibited, and the barbarous cruelties they have endured, make a chapter which even of the people of the Southern States will, long years hence, dwell on perhaps, with mingled pride and pain, but with more interest than on any other in American history. We know how terribly that State has been ravaged by the prevalence of the rebellion within its limits. And Missouri, which has not only elected unconditional loyalists, but unconditional emancipationists to this House, has also been the bloody battle field in which Missourians have been engaged in either army. If it be not true, sir, that slavery is the root of this rebellion, I ask some inspired man to indicate its moving cause, for human wisdom cannot detect it elsewhere.

Now, can it be possible, Mr. Chairman, that the only right so secured on earth that men cannot abjure it, nor Government divest them of it even to save itself in death struggle, is the right of holding fellow beings in bondage? The proposition that we have not the right to invite these slaves to freedom and our standard involves just this theory—that the rebels cannot by the most flagrant treason divest themselves of the right to hold these people in bondage; that the people cannot acquire freedom for themselves, and that no power in the Constitution, or in the war power, or deducible from history or philosophy, can relieve them from the duty of assisting the enemies of the country to destroy its life. Let the arguments be expressed as they may, with all the eloquence

and elegance with which care and time have clothed them in the mouths of the gentlemen from Kentucky and Maryland, [Messrs. YEAMAN and CRISFIELD,] they come to this. And until gentlemen can demonstrate this extraordinary proposition, they cannot impair the force of the President's proclamation, in accordance, as it is, with all law and all history, with the best impulses of humanity, and the spirit of our charter of freedom, and with the growing tendency of our age. The gentleman from Maryland asks, "will this bring peace? Will the South ever consent to come in under such an arrangement?" Sir, I do not propose to, nor ought the Government to ask the South on what terms it will come in. What the Government ought to do, and what I trust it will do, is to go straight forward and establish its power by crushing out all armed resistance, and when that is done, let it govern the region as a Territory, if the people will not establish their own government. In this condition let the contumacious remain; but whenever they will establish governments for themselves, adopt State constitutions, open the courts, elect Legislatures, and by them and the people elect Senators and members of Congress, receive them as States into the Union, under such designations as they may choose, whether novel or familiar. By this means, the forms and vital principles of our Government will he preserved, and peace and constitutional freedom be secured to the people of distant ages. Whenever this Government puts forth its power to the end that it is bound to assert, there will be no question as to whether we mean to violate the Constitution or whether the people of the South will accept the constitutional terms we offer them.

"But," said the gentleman this morning, "will the border States tolerate it?" To be sure they will. True, many of their citizens may dislike to see the Southern market closed against their human cattle, but the rebellion has gone so far that, with the 1st of January slavery dies south of the border State line; and when there is no market for men, women, and children, south of Virginia and Kentucky, slavery will have small value in any of the border States. I think I see the hand of God in these movements. The events of the time are deplorable, indeed; but I know that His providences are inscrutable, and that he can make the folly and wrath of man to praise Him. I had long seen that if the Democratic party could continue the misrule which it had enforced on the people for years, and especially its aggressions upon the rights of the laborers of the country, a war would come which would be at the door of every man's home. Let us look at it. "A house devided against itself cannot stand," quoted my friend from Maryland, and with grave deprecation. Did not the leaders of the South divide our house? Let us look at it. Go where you will, Mr. Chairman, in our Northern States, you find the Constitution of the United States taught in our elementary schools, and its democratic spirit everywhere inculcated. You find our youth growing up at the foot of the hustings; and the great doctrine taught to every child is: "You are as good as any other child. When you come to manhood you are to be equal, before the State, of every other man. You must watch, guard, and maintain all your rights." Thus is the democratic sentiment stimulated in every school, from every lecture stand, at every political gathering; and the political sentiment of the whole North is that of individualism and equality. And once in seven days comes the sabbath; and from hillside and valley, from the lanes and alleys, as well as from the broad streets of the city, the children gather in the church and Sunday school: There they learn that Christianity enforces while it refines and exalts the doctrines inculcated in the secular school; thus the religious sentiment adds its great power to the political. "These poor are as good as you," says the teacher. "These blind, and lame, and halt, are the children of your Father; and inasmuch as you do kindness unto them, you perform your duty unto Him." Thus the political and religious sentiments blend; and theirs is an ever growing power. Of this we have ample evidence all over the North, in the elaborate comforts of our eleemosynary institutions, and the care that is taken of our prisoners. I had the honor, a few days ago, to receive from our Philadelphia Prison Discipline Society, several volumns of its Journal, for the Congressional Library. The deaf, the dumb, the blind, the insane, are cared for. Homes are established for friendless children, where the waifs of society, the offspring of the destitute and fallen, the pauper and the felon, are cared for and reared in these teachings of democracy and Christianity. Thus the sentiment spreads and deepens and grows.

We have one institution in the North, the outgrowth of the perpetual contest between labor and capital, that, could the South have carried its domination a little further, would have made war and bloodshed over the whole country. It consists of hardy working men and is known as the trades union. We at the North live by

wages. Our men are familiar with toil; our women do not shrink from it. We recognize the maxim, as true to-day as the day when it was first written in homely English:

"Man labors from sun to sun,
But woman's work is never done."

We all labor, and wages is the foundation of the welfare and abundance of our people The idea that induced this rebellion and the supremacy of which could alone have averted it, was that slavery should be only extended into the new Territories of the country, but be domesticated in all the States. It was first to be introduced into the States by gentlemen *in transitu* with their colonies. The roll of Mr. Toombs's slaves was to be called at the foot of Bunker Hill. We were told in social intercourse in Philadelphia, of Mr. Yancey, that he would yet visit Independence Hall with his slaves. The re-establishment of the right to hold slaves all over the country was the purpose of the leaders of our "wayward sisters." Nothing less would satisfy them. Sir, had that thing been accomplished, the trade unions of the North would either have throttled the slaveholders, or, under the influence of the prejudices of caste and color, throttled the unhappy slaves, perhaps both. Here let me notice the remark of the gentleman from Maryland, that he does not agree with either of the two factions. Of what factions does he speak? The governments of the Union and the confederacy? Sir, it is the first time I ever heard the Government of the United States denounced as a faction in the Halls of Congress. Nor are they who are devoting all their energies to the support of the President and the Constitution to be denounced as a faction. I look in vain through this House for two factions.

I see that the Government, with a million of men, defending itself and attempting to enforce its laws over its own dominions, has been resisted by a body of armed rebels, and that those who sympathize with them, in a greater or less degree, are attempting to embarrass it; but other faction I have not been able to discover. There were two factions before the war broke out. Anterior to that event, there was a body of men in the North, who, under Christian impulses, believing it to be a duty to labor for the oppressed, and that it is a crime to hold men and women in bondage, were willing to violate all civic restraints in order to give freedom, culture, and hope to the slave. The abolitionists may have been entitled to that epithet. And there were southern men, on the other hand, determined, as I have indicated, to carry their institutions all over the North—to make slavery national by perverting the Constitution. There were, then, two factions—devotion to right and justice, perhaps not restrained by a proper prudence on the one hand, and love of lucre, power, and lust, that blotted out all sympathy with humanity, on the other, characterized the leaders of these factions.

Had the Southern faction been permitted to dominate until the roll of Southern slaves had been called in every county in every Northern State, there would have broken out a war—a war coextensive with the country, and bloody, at every hearthstone—a war which might have been of races, or in which those who claimed their human property would have suffered with their unhappy and proscribed chattels. The white men of the North, who, from their own hard-earned and hoarded wages, will support their unemployed craftsmen rather than let him work for under wages, would hardly have permitted men to work beside them for nothing, and throw their babies as property into the scale with their unrequited toil. [Laughter.]

Sir, I believe this war was inevitable. The insane ambition and mad, craving lust of the South could be checked alone by the results of war. It had closed in ears hermetically against the voice of persuasion and reason. And wherever slavery existed that ambition and that lust had root. Slavery did cause this war. It was destined to cause war, and if not put in process of eradication, will involve our posterity in war. Is it not fitting, therefore, that the result of the war shall be the end of slavery? The President's proclamation does not propose to touch the institution in the border States. But, as I have said, with the market for the annual crop gone, it will be found to be of no more value in Kentucky than it is now found to be in Missouri, with her free surroundings. And then we will come to what I am prepared to say very few words upon, the compensated emancipation proposition of the President.

The countless millions, the millions of millions that we have heard from the other side are to be expended in compensated emancipation, will be somewhat reduced when we come to remember that it is only the loyal men of the border States that we will have to deal with.

Missouri is here, asking $10,000,000 on condition that she emancipates her slaves within a little more than a year. In God's name, let us give it to her; and if Kentucky and Maryland make the same claim, let us give it to them, and pay our full share out of the results of our own hard labor at the North. Let us even, by an addition to our already grievous burden of taxes, imposed by this war — slavery's own offspring — share the losses of those whose slaves shall be exalted into freemen.

But, say the gentlemen, the proclamation is unconstitutional and illegal, and therefore void. I fear self-interest blinds some of them. It is a professional maxim that he has a fool for a client who takes charge of his own case. Certainly, no disinterested lawyer will dispute the validity of the proclamation of the Commander-in-Chief inviting to our flag people of the rebel States, and promising them protection and the enjoyment of constitutional rights. But will the proclamation be enforced? Yes, that is certain as the coming of the new year. And I ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. YEAMAN] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CRISFIELD] to pause in the career they open by their speeches of yesterday and to-day. Both profess, truly, I doubt not, to desire peace; both assure us that they would give utterance to no words that would add to the discord of the country. Let them then look the facts in the face. Gentlemen, do you not see that time and Providence are conspiring with man to put an end to the sole source of discord to the country? Do you not see that it was this institution which created division even in the convention that formed our Constitution? Do you not see that it has been this institution that, from the early settlement of the country down to the present time, has produced more of discord than all other causes combined.

The eloquent gentleman from Kentucky yesterday asserted that this rebellion had been ripening from 1798. I agree with him that that was one standpoint in its progress. The resolutions of 1798 marked a new epoch. But if he will go further back he will find, in the debates of the Convention which framed the Constitution, abundant evidence that slavery was and had been a source of discord, and that it came well nigh preventing the establishment of a Union. It has been a source of discord only; never was it a blessing to any State or people.

I have no special love for the negro. I am proud of the race of which, by the blessing of God, I am a member. It is not for the negro that I plead. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RICHARDSON] the other day said that all our sympathy and all our action was for the negro, but not one thing did we propose to do for the white man. Has he never heard of the creature—MAN I speak for man, the child of God, irrespective of the color of his skin.

Look at the baneful influence of slavery upon both white and black. You point me to statistics from the North to show that poverty and crime prevail with the negro there is undue proportion. I point you back to your laws that made it a felony to teach him to read and write, by which he might have drawn moral precepts and power from the same sources that your white children draw them. I point back to the fact that you have never allowed him the stimulus of hope. I say that your accursed institution, and the cruelty and depression inseparable from it, have not only filled our jails with your victims but has brought proverty to both races wherever it has existed. Why is it that Massachusetts, whose soil is so thin that the rocks peep through nearly every acre, like the knees and elbows through a beggar's garment—Massachusetts, which cannot raise enough per annum to feed her own people for a week, is yet rich and populous; while Maryland, abounding in agricultural and mineral resources, to a degree that few States can compare with, lags constantly dragging in the rear?*

---

* I extract the following from a letter dated Williamsport, Maryland, November 27. 1862, addressed to me by an officer of a Maryland regiment. The writer is a native of that State:

"While I am writing you I cannot refrain from making a statement or two with regard to the topography of this part of Mary and Doubtless you have a correct knowledge of it generally, and perhaps, in detail, but no one can know and appreciate it without traveling over it and through it. I have gone over it some in reconnoitering; but there are, of course, many peculiarities which I have not seen. Its fertility is unsurpassed, but its chief characteristic seems to be its boundless *water power*. To say nothing of the Patapsco, Monocacy, Middletown, Valley Creek, Antietam, Conocheague, and many other large streams, you meet almost at the end of every mile, a stream sufficient to run a gang of mills. As I ride over this country the question comes up in my mind can it be possible that Providence ever designed that these mighty waters should run to waste, or that these wonderful natural facilities should always be unavailable? And the answer comes back—no! The day will come when the busy hum of the factory and the mighty blows of the forge hammer will be heard among these mountains; when the exhaustless treasures which are hidden therein shall be brought forth, and when thousands and thousands of glad hearts and merry voices shall shout a hearty welcome to a new era. To accept anything else would be equivalent to an acknowledgment that God never designed intelligence and industry to have any part in mundane affairs."

3 0112 098216085

Why is it that old Virginia, possessing, as she did, the finest harbor and leading seaport of the country at the time of the adoption of the Constitution with nobler rivers than flow through any other State; with mineral resources that California herself might envy—untold wealth of iron and coal to encourage and stimulate the influx of intelligent and enterprising people—lying nearer to the West than other States with fine harbors; with every blessing that God could lavish upon a territory; why is it, I say, that the Old Dominion has sunk down and down, until her own children turn from their proud pre-eminence, and sneer at her decrepitude? Why, it was because your lords of the soil converted man into property. It was because you banished hope from your laborers; because you did not permit the toiling mother to love the child she had borne with assurance that it was hers, even through childhood. It is this which has made you poor, notwithstanding your mineral deposits, your rivers, and your vast agricultural resources. You have made the negro a curse to you; for God never permits a great wrong to go unpunished.

When, in another year, Congress assembles in these halls there will be no pictures drawn such as the gentlemen have furnished us with, of homes desolated or destroyed, women ravished, masters murdered by slaves converted into freemen, and greatful for the greatest blessing of life. The voice of thanksgiving and praise will come from every heart to whom freedom has been given. It will come from the white man as well as the freed slaves, in tones of praise and hallelujah.

There is, however, one thing the people of the rebellious States have to guard against. Of that they must beware. Let them not undertake to re-enslave the freed men that the President of the United States delivers by his proclamation, or woe may betide them. Let them not thus invite the horrors of St. Domingo. The voice of history admonishes them fully on this point. If they do it will be their act, and not the President's or ours. He will make them free, and they will rejoice in their freedom, and be humbly grateful. Not in the hour of joy and gratitude, and when singing praises for their deliverance is the tiger let loose in men. As God will have wrought this change He will guide it. But let man attempt to reverse his Providence and who shall answer for his folly?

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY
FEB 4 1924